Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0249TN-1 for Campbell County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Campbell County tells a compelling story of how all schools and all students will participate in this grant and how all schools are high-need. However, while the application states that each school has a unique culture and unique needs, the narrative does not indicate how those different needs will be addressed.

It is clear from the application that there is a strong commitment to the implementation of college and career ready standards and to building data systems. CCSS is in a state where a robust data system has been available for many years. However, it is not really clear what the district's strategy will be for addressing the training needs of its teaching staff regarding data. And, while there has been activity around turning around low-performing schools, there is little information about what strategies were used, nor any concrete details about how the data will be used in the proposed grant activities to make further progress on this goal.

CCSS shows committment to the goal of accelerating student achievement, and describes how it will utilize the SCORE network and look to successful schools for practices, and how the solutions for each school must be appropriate to the unique needs of each school. However, beyond that, there are gaps in the evidence of a clear, concrete strategy for improvement. Similarly, regarding increasing equity through personalized support, CCSS indicates that there will be an emphasis on data and teacher training, but without concrete details of what type of training or how that data would be better used.

This response scores in the medium range. While the committment to the goals of Race to the Top is evident, the concrete details that explain how the district will achieve those goals are lacking.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS indicates that all school will participate in the proposed grant activities and make a compelling case. Details about countywide poverty rates, unemployment rates, literacy rates, and other socioeconomic factors paint a picture of a county dealing with significant rural poverty issues. Data for all schools is provided as spelled out in the criterion, and no school has fewer than 65% of its students from low-income families. All participating schools thus meet the eligibility requirements. Thus, this application scores in the high range.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	**10**	**2**

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS's application is generally focused on increasing use of data, training teachers in data analysis, hiring data and curriculum specialists, and purchasing technology. These areas of focused are described throughout the application. The goals CCSS has set for this grant are clear. However, many of the sections lack cohesion or connection to each other. There is no overall logic model or theory of change that is specifically linked to the goals and activities. For example, little concrete detail is provided on what types of professional development will be provided to teachers to ensure they have the skills to use data or teach with new technology. Little is provided by way of detailed timelines. For example, deploying

iPads to a large number of students requires a significant amount of planning and involves many steps, such as configuring, charging, app purchase and installation, insurance, and logistics for actual distribution. Similarly, for professional development, the application mentioned the Flippen Group, but also emphasizes that the professional development provided by this group focuses on school climate and culture. Therefore, there is inadequate information about the nature of the professional development that would meet the needs of teachers regarding data and technology. Finally, the application emphasizes that data and curriculum specialists will be hired using grant monies, which leaves open the question of how change will be scaled up and sustainable beyond the life of the grant.

The application does not describe a process by which grant activties are piloted in some schools or grades before expanding to others; rather, it seems to assume that all schools will be implementing simultaneously, which could pose a signficant implementation challenge.

This section does not include any concrete information regarding responsible parties or deliverables. School leadership teams are mentioned in section E (1), but those leadership teams are not described in detail nor are they discussed elsewhere in the application. Therefore, this application scores in the low range.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

While CCSS clearly addresses summative assessments, achievement gaps, and graduation rates, the goals are not nearly ambitious enough to justify such a significant federal investment. For example, the application lists that the percent proficient will increase from 51% in third grade science to 53%, and the goal for eighth grade math proficience increases from 18% proficient to 26%. These are strikingly low. While CCSS describes a situation of low funding and high poverty, to justify a federal investment of this scale, the bar is not high enough.

Similarly, the goals for improving graduation rates are very low. Jelico High School is projected to increase from 54.2% graduating to 56%. This still leaves an unacceptably high dropout rate. Also, there may be an error in reporting as gradation and college enrollment rates for the two high schools are identical in one table but are not in a second table in section E.

The meaning of the numbers provided regarding the growth model are not adequately explained. Jacksboro Middle School is listed as having the goal of reducing the gap between economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged students from 19.8 percentage points to 4.1 percentage points, but most other schools only reduce the gap by four or five points. Again, this is insufficient to merit significant federal investment. This section scores in the low range.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS describes its track record of improvement by describing first its continuing expenditure inequities, describing letter grades awarded by the state in writing, and numerical results of the state growth standard. These data points are not used in other sections, and little context is provided for what the numbers mean. For example, the application states that "in sixth grade Mathematics Campbell County exceeded the state growth standard by 4.5." But it is not clear what 4.5 refers to or what that number means in context. CCSS does not provide any evidence of increasing graduation rates or college enrollment.

CCSS also provides a description of earlier high school reform efforts that included high school redesign efforts, including a listing of the goals of that redesign, although there is little discussion, lessons learned, or results, other than a comment in another section that improvements at Jelico HS were not sustained.

CCSS does indicate that it makes student performance data available to students, educators, and the public. However, given the low levels of literacy in the community, the application does not explain well enough how the district makes efforts to make that data accessible to all members of the community. This section scores in the low range.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS provides evidence indicating that all required data is publicly available in a transparent way. Practices and policies in place include a budget book including line items for all areas described in the selection criterion that is publicly available, public meetings including school board meetings, open houses, and publishing the school budget in the local newspaper. This information is sufficient to merit a high range score.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS indicates that current RTT efforts in the state will support their work, and that there are sufficient conditions to support their efforts, including access to a wide range of assessment tools and digital learning tools, as well as an existing professional development plan. CCSS already has access to the robust data system that the state of Tennessee makes available. The district also has assessment tools including DIBELS and Discovery Education, which indicates that many resources are already in place that can further student learning. The district has also been implementing district-wide professional development for several years, indicating that the systems are in place to implement further professional development initiatives. Elsewhere in the application, it is mentioned that the state is investigating moving away from Carnegie units to allow more ways for students to demonstrate competency. This, along with Tennessee's Race to the Top Status, provides sufficient evidence of positive state context for implementation.

The state of Tennessee did not provide specific comments but did provide a letter indicating that the state would only provide comments to a small number of applicants due to the volume of applications. There is no doubt that the district has sufficient autonomy to carry out the activities in the grant. This section scores in the high range.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS provides a detailed and solid description of the stakeholder engagement process. The application describes a series of stakeholder and committee meetings, surveys, and Title I schoolwide committee meetings. Of interest is the point that stakeholder input led to a recommendation of iPads which differed from the original committee's recommendation. This shows that the committee was truly open to community input. Teacher support appears to be solid: 75.5% of teachers responded to the teacher survey. If nonrespondents are included, the 272 teachers who responded "yes" to the question "do you support our efforts to pursue RTTT funding?" means that a total of at least 71.6% of teacher support the effort overall, which meets the criteria. Additionally, 100% of principals who responded to the district survey indicated their support for the proposal. The letters of support from community organizations, including businesses, postsecondary institutions, parents, students, and other governmental and non-governmental organizations, were thorough and supportive. The application included results of the stakeholder surveys which provided further insight into the context and culture of the district. CCSS has a strong foundation upon which to improve learning for all students. Therefore, this section scores in the high range.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS provides an overview of its initial needs analysis. It is clear that the district understands the nature of the work it is proposing and the importance of the shift in teaching that needs to take place and the overall logic behind the proposal is evident in the emphasis on a shared vision for personalized learning based on competencies. However, the description of analysis of needs and gaps is lacking in context. Numbers are provided with little description of what those numbers mean or why they are important. Further, numbers alone, such as those provided in the table in section B (5), are not a sufficient

needs assessment. The application states that "Our schools do not currently have personalized learning environments for students as a district wide initiative to personalize and connect learning." However, based on the descriptions throughout the application, some personalized learning is taking place in classrooms, just not strategically or systemically. This section also includes a broad timeline that describes the progression that would take place from personnel development, technology acquistion, evaluation, and adjustment. However, this timeline is not very specific and does not include specific deliverables or responsible parties in accordance with the definition of a high-quality plan. This section scores in the low to medium range.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**7**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, CCSS outlines a wide range of activities and plans for district improvement in a wide range of areas, including parent engagement, dual enrollment, personalized learning paths (PLP), a www.collegefortn.org website, project-based learning, and much more. However, these activities are not very well linked to the needs outlined in section A, particularly around the use of data and the need for tablet technology. Furthermore, the personalized learning paths are not very well defined or described. In some sections the personalized learning paths are described as beginning in Kindergarten, and in others in grade 3. Assessing students each semester and at the end of the course is not adequate for truly personalized learning. In other sections, CCSS mentions other formative assessments, but it is not clear how those assessments will be used in the PLP. Project-based learning, while a key strategy, is not described in much depth, and merely requiring its use in classrooms will not produce results for students.

In subpart (a), the application describes how students will gain a better sense of the relevance of their learning, through parent outreach that starts in pre-K and continues through the child's educational career. Emphasis is also placed on successful transitions to high school that lead to college readiness and partnership that provide dual-enrollment opportunities. Expanding these opportunities is an important goal for the students of CCSS, for rural students often do not have access to these types of activities that can help increase college enrollments.

In the area of ensuring that each student has access to personalized content and skill development, there is more detail provided about the PLP, but it is not clearly linked to the PLP in the previous section. Nor are the activities in this section clearly linked to the technology or professional development for which the case was made in section A. While collaborative planning time is a strong strategy, the goal of that time and how it would be linked to better use of data or technology is not clear.

In subpart b, there are several descriptions of desired changes in teaching practices, which supports the goals of the district. Cross-curricular teaching and bringing highly effective teachers in to model effective instruction have great potential to improve learning in the district.

The response to (b) (ii) is focused on a survey to assess school climate, which, in the context of CCSS, is important, but does not address the question, which is about the range of *instructional* environments. This question is about how teachers will find ways to differentiate their teaching to meet each students' needs.

In (b) (iii), there is not enough information about what the goals of the iPad deployment would be, what the computer skills course would include, and what kind of content. Earlier sections reference Discovery and e2020, but those are not mentioned in this section, leaving the role of those tools in personalizing learning unclear.

In (b) (iv) the criterion references "frequently" updated data, but it is not clear how "frequently" is defined or determined. The descriptions of the types of assessment data that would be used in the personalized learning plans does not have sufficient detail or clarity.

In section (c) there is a solid description of the need to support book purchases for dual enrollment students and the importance of a full-service school, but again, these efforts are not linked to any other section of the application, including

the timelines, nor are they linked to the use of data, professional development and technology described in the application.

This section score in the low range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	7

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS outlines a strategy that includes cross-curriculum lessons, personalized learning paths, assessments and surveys, making better use of counselors, and hiring of curriculum and data specialists. However, as in previous sections, very little detailed of these PLPs is provided. Efforts to address adapted content that addresses students individual needs and interest includes, as in previous sections, project-based learning, service-based learning, and extra-curricular activities. However, it is not clear how teachers will be trained and monitored in their efforts to implement these instructional strategies, who the responsible parties are, or what timeline this strategy will follow.

With regard to data and measuring of student progress, CCSS describes several instruments, including Discovery, TCAP, EXPLORE, benchmark tests, end of course tests, ACT, and AP. However, currently only high schools have a data and curriculum coordinator to fine tune instruction, and CCSS would like to hire additional staff for this need. Again, however, there is no timeline, no deliverable, and there are not many details about how this would improve the individual and collective practice of the rest of the teachers in the buildings.

With regard to improving teacher and principal practice, CCSS describes how teachers and principals meet with evaluators, but these evaluators and their roles are not described or put in context. Partnerships with postsecondary institutions are another component of the plan but still lacks timeline, deliverables, or responsible parties.

CCSS provides a little more detail in subsection (b) about identifying students who are at-risk for additional interventions as part of the description of the need for more data and curriculum coordinators. However it is still not clear how all teachers would have opportunities to improve their own knowledge utilizing the robust data system that is provided by the state. Additionally, while faculty, parent, and student surveys is a useful tool, it would be helpful to know what types of questions, how the surveys would be administered, and how often, and if the district would work to find ways to reach the parents or community members who are not fully literate.

CCSS describes how it will implement online tutoring for homework help, but given the resources currently available to CCSS, such as e2020 and Discovery, there is a lot more they could be doing in terms of digital resources. Homework help is not an adequate justification for a federal investment. Finally, CCSS does not adequately define "rigorous and challenging" curricula that would reduce the need for remedial coursework.

CCSS also describes intervention labs, Graduation Alternative Program, and its Alternative Learning Center, but does not indicate how students are selected for this, how effective it has been, how it is staffed, where or when students attend, or how many students currently attend and if the goal is to increase that number, and if so, by how much.

CCSS needs to further explain how the professional development from the Flippen Group, which seems to focus more on school culture, climate, and safety, will support its efforts to help teachers use technology and data effectively to improved student learning. The application also indicates that the "school environment will be challenging and rewarding academically" and that "we have fair and effective rules," but not enough detail is provided about what a challenging and rewarding environment looks like, how it might be different in each school, what steps would be taken to pursue that goal, and what the timeline would be.

With regard to training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress, CCSS has some quality tools at its disposal, including Discovery, e2020, and a wide range of assessments. CCSS is able to use data to evaluate effectiveness of of its GAP, but the application lacks specificity for how federal resources would be used to further this goal.

This application does not contain any firm clear information about how the federal investment would be used to increase the number of students who receive high quality instruction from effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, or specialty areas. This is particularly important due to CCSS's status as a rural area with significant poverty rates.

Overall, while several key areas of the selection criterion are addressed, there is not adequate evidence of a high quality plan for improving teaching and learning through the activities of this grant. This section scores on the low end of the middle range.

This section score in the low end of the middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**7**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This application includes a solid description of a grant oversight committee structure and a good plan that outlines meetings and activities. However, more detail could be provided about the "proven professionals" that are serving on this team. The application also clearly describes that school leadership teams have sufficient autonomy and flexibility to implement the activities in the grant. While it is good to note that the state is considering efforts to move away from the Carnegie Unit, this application does not make a link between the goal of mastery and the tools already in place such as e2020 or the GAP/Alternative learning center.

Efforts to have mandatory parent meetings to meet the requirements of subection (e) are laudable, but it is not clear how the school district will ensure those meetings taking place. For example, the district specifically mentions that most students do not live with two parents, but does not indicate what, if any, supports will be in place for those families. The district also mentions a new 21st Century grant for after school programs, but does not elaborate on how those grant activities will support the efforts of Race to the Top-District to expand learning opportunities. This section also does not provide any information about how the tools and assessments will specifically be made accessible to students with special needs. This section scores in the middle range.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**4**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section of the grant application requires significant investment, yet very little detail is provided. While the application describes that devices will be purchased, there is no timeline or plan for deployment, no description of how technical support, repairs, and other support needs will be met. It is not clear how many devices will be purchased. In section C states that "each student in the school having access to his or her personal iPad," but it is not clear if this in fact includes all students K-12, as the stakeholder input section specifically mentioned that the stakeholder input committee recommended "iPads for the middle and high school students and I-Tabs for elementary students." Sections D and E indicate that the iPad devices will be available for checkout from carts, which is not the same as every student having his or her personal iPad. This does not paint a clear enough picture of what student access to the devices will actually be. Further, it's not clear if teachers will be issued iPads as well, or if there will be different devices for teacher use. The application also states that "CCSS will employ multiple support platforms for both students and parents" but information about what type of support platforms or how those platforms will be implemented is not provided.

The parent center is a strong component of subsection (c), but there is little information as to how parents will be able to access data and supported in that effort. Information about how the parent centers will be staffed, what hours the parent centers will be open, or other information about how the parent centers will meet the goals of this section are not described. Creating a space and providing the equipment does not ensure that parents and students can export data in a range of formats. Further, this section of the application does not provide any information about how it will ensure that all resources utilize interoperable data systems or what standards those sysetms must meet. Points here are awarded for the online grading system and parent center and this section scores at the low end of the middle range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**5**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS has a strong foundation of community involvement upon which to build, and describes a variety of school leadership teams and a district leadership team, but these teams are not referenced anywhere else in the grant. The application emphasizes the role of data and data monitoring as part of a feedback process, but the focus of this data review is on student proficiency, and there is little by way of specific description of how that data would be used to modify and adapt the improvement strategy writ large. Rather, for example, "Data studies will be reviewed monthly to estimate rate of improvement, identify students who are not demonstrating adequate progress, and compare the efficacy of interventions to design more effective individual instruction for subgroups in need of improvement." This does not fully address selection criteria E (1). Further, this section does not address how the district will share information on the quality of investements beyond standard communications efforts. Section E (3) mentions that the University of Tennessee will be brought in as an external evaluator; however, there is no information about how that evaluation will be structured, whether it will included formative or summative feedback, and there is no supporting letter to indicate that UT is actively involved in the planning. And, as with earlier sections of the application, the student proficiency goals listed in this section lack ambition. Having fewer than half of elementary and middle school students proficient on assessments is not an adequate goal. However, the the table in E (1) does list key areas that will be essential to the continuous improvement process, and the district's committtment to continually improving to better meet the needs of its students is clear. This section scores in the low end of the middle range.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**1**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS describes basic strategies for internal and external stakeholders but it is not clear that this communication and engagement would result in useful feedback for continous improvement. The strategies outlined here, such as Open Houses, annual carnivals, and monthly board meetings, are generally standard operating procedures, and it is not clear how federal investment would support scaling up or improvement of these activities. Another strategy mentioned is Title I required meetings, so it is also not clear how Race to the Top funds would support any improvements in this area. There is no mention of the Grant Oversight Committee mentioned in section D (1), or the EPICC Program Director, in the continuous improvement process. Nor is there a mention of how the Parent Centers described elsewhere in the grant might be part of communication with external stakeholders. Additionally, postsecondary institutions seem to be missing from this section, which is an oversight given that the partnerships with postsecondary are part of the improvement strategy. This section scores in the low range.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	**5**	**1**

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS describes the required performance measures outlined in the selection criteria, but the goals outlined in the tables is not explicitly connected to the accompanying narrative. Numbers and goals are provided for the number of students served by effective teachers and principals. However, the state's system for determining an effective teacher is not described in any detail in this application, so the context for the goals that have been set is not very clear. Nor is improving teacher effectiveness described in any detail anywhere else in section E. Further, the subgroups listed in the performance measure (a) are schools, not subgroups as defined in the notice. The on-track indicator, is not described in detail nor is it described anywhere else in the application. Another goal listed is the reduction in the number of students who are Below Basic on the state assessment, but these goals are still not very ambitious. In many schools and grades there would still be more than half of the students in the school performing at below basic, which is not aligned with the goals of the grant. The performance measures may be achievable, but they are not ambitious. Grades 4-8 b,c does provide goals regarding the achievement gaps for economically disadvantaged students, but no context is provided for this indicator, how it was determined, or what it means. For the high schools, the FAFSA indicator goals are provided, but they increase only 1-2% a year between 2012-13 and the end of the grant. The on-track indicator for high school students appears to be performance on specific end of course tests. These goals are signficantly higher than the proficiency goals in section A. However, the high school career-readiness indicator is not described and subgroups are not available. High school performance

measure d is also confusing, as it shows what appears to be proficiency percentages but that decrease over time rather than increase.

There is no health or social-emotional indicator listed.

For all these indicators, there is no description of how these measures may be reviewed over time. An external evaluation is mentioned, but there is no supporting detail, information, or letter of support. There is little connection between the tables and the supporting narrative. This section scores at the low end of the low range.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	**5**	**1**

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

As in the previous section, an external evaluation with the University of Tennessee is mentioned in section E (3) as follows: "CCSS will also bring in an independent evaluator from The University of Tennessee to do all overall effectiveness of all resources and funded activities in the Race to the Top grant for the four year grant period." There is no other reponse in section E (4). As a result there is insufficient detail to fully evaluate or understand how this component will work or otherwise contribute to the success of the investment. The applicant does not provide a clear discussion of how technology use would be evaluated, other than with student performance data; how professional development would be evaluated, other than with student performance data, or how any other aspects of the grant activities, such as the parent center, the credit recovery efforts, or the iPad initiative would be qualitatively or quantitatively evaluated. Therefore this section scores in the low range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	**10**	**2**

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative provided for section F focuses primarily on critierion F (2), sustainability. There is inadequate narrative provided for F (1). CCSS mentions that "GEARUP TN Grant, LEAPS, and the SAFE SCHOOLS Grant" funds will provide sustainability, and that, for example, the grant would "would work jointly with the GEARUP TN grant to provide transportation to colleges, technical, and community colleges for campus tours and cultural events such as plays, music, and theater events." However, no mention is made in the budget tables of these funding sources nor is the total revenue from these sources provided. Further, transportation project funds are described as being used to allow more students to participate in extracurricular activities such as sports or clubs, but it these are not explicitly linked to the goals of the grant around personalization and improving academic achievement.

Job descriptions and professional development descriptions are provided but are very brief, and there is no information to provide assurance of the quality of that professional development. There is also inadequate detail about the professional development in terms of number of teachers served in what period of time or number of hours. Of particular concern is the data and curriculum coaches and specialists. It is not clear if or how those positions be continued after the grant, and if not, how it will be ensured that teachers have the necessary skills to continue the work.

The grant indicates that all funds will be used across all four years of the grant. However, the section of the budget describing technology purchases does not indicate if devices would be purchased all in the first year or distributed across the grant period.

This section scores in the low range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**2**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS describes its goals for sustainability, but provides little detail of specific activities, timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties in accordance with the requirement to have a high quality plan. In Initiative #1, Personnel, the primary activities of the grant revolve around

hiring of instructional coaches (10), data coaches (3), technology support personnel (4), and transitional teachers (10), but says little of whether those positions would continue to be funded after the end of the grant period. The application makes the case that the knowledge, practice, and experience acquired by each school would continue, but there are no specifics that indicate how the district will ensure this happens or which responsible parties would manage that process.

In Initiative #2, Technology, the purchase of iPads and wireless internet is described primarily as serving the goal of allowing students to research colleges, fill out FAFSA forms, and complete college applications. The devices are also described as being critical to data capture and fulfilling state testing requirements, but not in sufficient detail. Additionally, a utility vehicle is mentioned in this narrative but is not listed in the budget tables. Finally, while the technology staff positions will end, CCSS asserts that the institutional knowledge will be sustainable as a result of train the trainer efforts, but there is little evidence to support this assertion.

In Initiative #3, Transportation, CCSS describes the need for additional transportation servics in the remote rural area the district serves. However, this goal is not explictly linked to the goals of the grant, with the exception of providing transportation for college visits.Further, this section also describes partnerships with GEAR UP that are not supported in the budget tables or elsewhere in the application.

The description of Initiative #4, Professional Development, states more goals and visions rather than timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties. The section concludes with the statement that "The LEA and other funding sources will continue to follow up on the grant initiatives" but there is no direct evidence to support that in terms of budget tables, specific funding sources, or other information.

Overall, this section lacks a high quality plan. Goals are stated, but supporting activities are incomplete. Timelines are not specified: most budget specifics are described per year, for all four years of the grant. Responsible parties are not described in detail. Therefore this section scores in low range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**1**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

It is clear that CCSS has some very strong partners who are poised to help deliver serious improvements system-wide. However, the indicators given are the same as in the rest of the application, and not connected explicitly to the partnerships. Only description of partner needs assessment is a survey but very little detail is provided regarding the content of the survey or how the surveys will be administered.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Not Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

CCSS has outlined a series of activities focused on professional development, increasing use of data, commitment to career and college-ready standards, acquisition of wireless devices, and other supporting activities. However, several key pieces are not described in enough detail to allow this application to meet the requirements of Absolute Priority 1.

First, the personalized learning plans are not described in enough detail to merit federal investment. These plans are critical to the success of RTTT-D but there is no specificity as to what these plans will contain, how frequently students will be assessed, or how contect will be personalized for individual students. While CCSS already has several potentially useful digital tools as part of its infrastructure, such as Discovery Ed and e2020, there is no clear linkage between these or any other tools in creating a truly personalized learning experience for students.

Second, the plan lacks necessary cohesiveness. There are many compenents here that have the potential to be powerful, such as external partnerships, the data infrastructure, interest in postsecondary success, and previous efforts to improve school climate and culture. These elements, however, are not explicitly linked together throughout the application. For example, the application describes a goal of expanding the existing Graduation Alternative Program; however, this program is not referenced in later sections of the application nor is it present in the budget. Similarly, project-based learning is described as an activity under the grant, but there is nothing specific in the budget tables that clarifies how and when teachers will be trained appropriately in project-based learning. Until these efforts can be knit together, their impact will be minimal. These efforts must be cohesive and coherent to truly make a difference for the students of Campbell County.

The application does not adequately address the goal of increasing the effectiveness of educators. While there is a clear component of professional development, it is not explicitly linked to Tennessee's rich and rigorous TVAAS system which would provide a valuable data component. Further, the professional development is not described in adequate detail to make a clear case that these efforts would result in improved student achievement.

Finally, this application does not meet the goals of RTTT around accelerating student achievement. Goals for student growth in this application are extremely low: as little as two or three percentage point gains in some areas. This is not in keeping with the goals of the Race to the Top program.

Total	210	88

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0249TN-2 for Campbell County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Campbell County School District met the requirements for articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.

The vision for reform includes:

- using data to inform and direct instruction

- a plan for professional development to learn to read and use data collected

- an individualized learning plan for each student based on their needs

- changes in policy to facilitate the plan i.e. reform in the professional development requirement currently mandated

- recognizing that the challenge to school wide reform is serving the economically disadvantaged in a more methodical manner

- recognizing that as a district they must optimize the tools at their disposal and augment with additional resources and improved practices

- empowering students, teachers and parents by providing access and ownership of their individual data AND training them to understand what the information   means and how it relates to them

- the proposal includes all schools and students in the district since they recognize that all students meet the qualifying criteria of the grant

- a technology plan to meet the needs of the students and their families

- transparency so that all stakeholders can remain engaged and aware

There were instances where the information provided was too vague. For example, CCSD wrote, "We will optimize the tools we have and augment those assets with additional resources and improved practices". CCSD provided sufficient detail regarding optimizing the tools and how they will improve practices but offered little or no information regarding what additional resources would be used. Detailing additional resources would have provided the peer reviewers with a a understanding of what other resources the district feel would be beneficial to their student population and community base.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Campbell County School District met and exceeded the requirements in their approach to implementation. The district recognizes that all of their schools meet the qualification criteria, have significant numbers of economically disadvantaged students and need the additional support to build upon recent test score improvements. Therefore, they have opted to include all students in the district in their plan.

Additionally, further defining statistical evidence supported their decision to include the entire school district.

Examples of statistical evidence:

- Poverty rate of 33.7%

- One in five adults (21%) cannot read or write at a six grade level

- 33% of the population does not have a high school diploma or a GED

- 42% of all households receive food stamps

- 59% of all students under the age of 18 are on state subsidized insurance plans

This proposal presents evidence that has met all criteria listed in this section.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Campbell County School District acknowledges that they are challenged on every front: limited funding, ill-prepared teachers to implement the Common Core Standards, students with little access to technology, parents also with limited access and little hope, and a community that wants change but has little direction.

CCSD has a plan to provide support and focused programs. Their goals are:

- Professional Development for teachers and administrators in data analysis

- Teachers and administrators with technical resources

- Provide time for professional learning communities in order to collaborate and identify focused instruction

- Students will learn to understand their own data and take ownership of it

-Students will have access to technology both at school and at home

- Students will have an individualized learning plan that will be their pathway to achievement

- Parents will also have access to resources and data

- Parents will learn how the data relates to their child

- The community will be kept engaged and accessed for additional support

- The community will be kept aware of progress

This district has presented a quality plan that will engage all stakeholders to bring sustainable change within their schools and community.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The outcomes that CCSD has enumerated set growth goals at a 2% increase in proficient and above test scores in all grades and all subject areas. In addition, projected decrease in achievement gap and increase in graduation rate was set at the rate of progression. Given that your proficiency level is not high, the growth goals did not, at first, appear to be ambitious. However, given the statistical evidence provided in regards to the overarching challenges the district and all stakeholders face, a two percent increase per year would be ambitious.

- CCSD has provided data that shows proficiency status in Math, Language Arts/Reading and Science for grades three - twelve. The assessment used to determine proficiency is the TCAP

- The methodology used to identify achievement gaps is economically disadvantaged students versus non economically disadvantaged.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	**Score**
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**10**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD provided much information that demonstrated a clear track record of success for three years as opposed four.

- Their writing scores for grades 5, 8, and 11 were A's and B's

- The 2011-2012 school year revealed scores of A in those same grades

- CCSD sixth graders exceeded the state growth standard by 4.5

- Seventh grade Language Arts/Reading scores exceeded the state growth standard by 1.6

Interestingly, six years ago 10 CCSD schools were in good standing and two were on the school improvement list (both high schools) At this time the district embarked on a high school redesign. The goals were and still are to:

- redesign the high schools to meet new standards and to prepare them for the next level of schooling

- to improve student proficiency and increase AYP achievement

- to use data to make informed decisions and create a system of continuous feedback and improvement

Evidence was presented in the narrative that reflects a closing of the achievement gaps within the economically disadvantaged group in the areas of Math and Reading in grades 3 - 12.

Further CCSD makes performance data available to students, educators, and parents through to following measures:

- MyGradePortal

- Public Title I meetings

- School Report Cards posted on the state website

CCSD has provided evidence of recent success to a district that has been struggling with many issues - high poverty, school not a priority in the community, low morale due to tragic circumstances. With this foothold and the proposal that CCSD has presented, long term reform is probable and will impact the community long after the expiration of the grant.

Data seemed out of alignment with what could be achieved - i.e. 100 percent of students will graduate and enroll in college. More specific detail would have strengthened the narrative as would defined acronyms.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD has met and exceeded increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.

Given that the former Director of Schools was convicted of misconduct, falsifying records and theft, the current administration seems to place great value in remaining transparent. CCSD has demonstrated this transparency by putting in to place multiple checks and balances. For example:

- An official budget book containing line items for personnel salaries by site, non-personnel expenditures and is available upon request

- Hosts open houses at each site to inform the public of their processes and practices in language that is easily understood

- District website is always available and provides access to school board policies and practices

- Community involvement is paramount therefore all PTO, Title I, open House and school level meetings are publicized in a variety of ways

- Yearly Title I meetings

- A detailed budget is published in two newspapers annually

- Monthly school board meetings

- Individual school financials are always available

Given the new leaderships willingness to be transparent in all areas, community trust will follow.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Part of the criterion for section (B)(3) is to show successful conditions for success. One of the statements that was made that CCSD "has an excellent early reading program design and have operated such a program for over a decade". The historical data for reading scores demonstrate a range of scores from 28% to 43% proficient and above. These scores do not reflect a decade of success. Another inconsistency in the narrative was the Albert Einstein quote, "The significant problems we face cannot be solved at the same level of thinking we were at when we created them". Again, if the reading program has not provided better results in a decade then perhaps the applicant is trying to improve scores with the same program that has produced low test scores.

It is evident that strides are being made to initiate Individualized Learning paths and that the basis for these paths is students data. Teachers are required to receive professional development in order to be able to interpret the data into meaningful learning paths for students.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD met the requirements for stakeholder engagement and support but failed to address the collective bargaining piece correctly. Since this district no longer has a collective bargaining agent the burden was to have 70 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal. The data in the narrative stated 287 of the 380 (75.5%) teachers <u>completed</u> the survey. The requirement was to show 70% of the teachers <u>supporting</u> the proposal.

Additionally, letters of support from a wide range of stakeholders were evidenced in the application. Through these letters of support, it is apparent that the community at large supports the school district and has confidence in their Director of Schools to facilitate the RTTD plan as outlined in the application.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD met the requirements for analysis of needs and gaps.

It essential that there be stakeholder buy-in.

- Through the narrative it is evident that this plan has a shared vision from all stakeholders to develop a strategic plan to implement personalized learning plans district wide.

- It is further evidenced that schools, teachers, and students have the same access to: professional development, content, instructional material aligned to college and career ready standards, digital learning and blended learning content and courses

- Student learning is based on demonstrated competency

- All students have a choice in their learning

- Continuous measures of student performance to inform the personalized learning paths

- this district has a four timeline in place that breaks down each phase logically and incrementally

CCSD has a proposed a high quality plan that both identifies needs and gaps that need to be addressed and provides clear pathways for the implementation of personalized learning environments.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD has met and exceeded the requirements for preparing students for college and careers. A comprehensive program was outlined by this organization.

Campbell County School District appears to recognize that parent outreach is paramount and has placed great emphasis on parental involvement. Their efforts will include:

- Pre-K Library open to parents with books available for children and parents for checkout

- Information about best health practices for Pre-K students and their siblings will also be available

- District will provide a transition team made up of teachers, administrators, audiologists, school counselors, and other key personnel as students move from Pre-K into Kindergarten

- The same type of team will handle the transition from elementary to middle school

- A program called Freshman 101 will be in place to guide students as they transition to high school.

- Freshman 101 will focus on: how credits are earned, study skills, library tours, campus layout, etc.

- Graduating seniors will serve as mentors during the Freshman 101 process

- Dual enrollment will be available through post-secondary institutions in the area

- ACT Prep will be available

- Students have the opportunity to attend the Technology campus in their area to learn a skill or earn a certificate

- A robust mentoring program will be initiated with college students, recent college graduates and community leaders

- Beginning in grade 3, students will create their own portfolio including a personal profile at www.collegefortn.org

- each student will have access to their own personal IPad

- students at the elementary level will receive instruction in keyboarding and basic computer skills

- Online tutoring assistance will be available and teachers are available daily from 8:00am until 6:00pm

- students will use project based learning and a service learning model

- both high schools will have a room designated for college access and assistance

- all students will be exposed to culturally diverse events and field trips

- students will be provided with internet access at home and an IPad

- students will be provided transportation to and from after school enrichment activities

- funding will be able to offset the cost of books for dual enrollment

- career planning services will be available as will mental health services

- a nurse practitioner will be available to address the medical needs of students that may be uninsured

- A school nutritionist will be available to help parents with affordable and healthy food ideas

- a clothes closet will be available for the homeless population that the school serves

As you can see from the list above, CCSD has taken a largely holistic approach to provide a high quality plan to improve the learning and teaching opportunities through the implementation of personalized learning plans that will provide students with a rigorous course of study that is aligned to college/career readiness standards. This approach both engages and empowers all students including high need students in an appropriate manner.

Details that were missing from the narrative were specific goals for the iPad stations. In addition, there was a lack of overall development of a cohesive plan. There were many activities listed but they were not directly linked to a goal.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD met the requirements for Preparing Students for College and careers - Teaching and Leading. Within this section there were a few discrepancies. One example would be: In section (C) (1) the narrative indicated that Personalized Learning Paths would be developed beginning in grade 3. In section (C) (2) the narrative indicated that PLP's will begin in Kindergarten. In addition, the teacher evaluation piece was not evident in the narrative. There were many positive attributes to the plan with several key items listed below:

- In this model the CCSD teachers would be required to teach a minimum of 5 cross-curricular lessons per semester and would allow for common planning time to accomplish this goal

- Each grade level has identifying benchmark testing to create a basis for the Personalized Learning Paths

- Elementary students will be introduced to the Project based learning model. Project based learning will be taught every six weeks

- This district plans to increase extra-curricular offerings to include a variety of interests for example - chess club, bass fishing club

- To improve teacher and administrator performance - meetings will be held frequently to discuss areas of need and successes

- Effort will be made to establish more partnerships with post-secondary institutions

- Plans to hire someone who can fully implement the Personalized Learning Paths

- Both high schools will have an intervention lab and a graduation alternative plan (GAP)

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**10**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This application details a planned infrastructure. At the top of the structure is the Director of Schools and includes a wide range of participants from school nutrition to special education professionals. This plan includes a separate oversight committee that will meet 6 times a year as well as a team of dedicated internal professionals. The plan allows for principals to make leadership and budget decisions at a site level and offers support if needed.

Currently the Tennessee Department of Education does not allow for students to earn credit based on mastery but change has been initiated at the legislative level. However, the district does provide opportunities for students to show mastery in different ways.

A parent resource center will be initiated through this grant where parents can seek resources for all students/families. Students that are English learners were not explicitly discussed.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- All students and parents will have access to computers, internet and printers

- the grant oversight committee will monitor all aspects of the grant including student information data, budget, data and instructional improvement

- A Program director will be hired to lead and manage the initiatives

- currently the district has a student information system that is password protected

- the district recognizes that professional development will be necessary for teachers and leaders

- include understanding and use of data and instructional strategies

Strong evidence showed that CCSD and the district infrastructure supports personalized learning. This plan ensures that all students, parents, teachers have access to the tools for success both in and out of school as detailed in the bullet points listed above. CCSD has proposed a large scale support model for technical support and access.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**13**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- outlined a very detailed continuous improvement process

- many layers of accountability

- applicant did not discuss plans for after the term of the grant

- a plan for continuous review of data in place

- a rigorous plan for professional development in place

- technology is a major focus for this district with plans to purchase tablets, laptops, internet access, etc for use by staff, parents and students

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**5**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Title I meetings with key stakeholders three times per year

- Monthly meet and greet meetings for the community

- Twice a year open house

- Career and Tech Education Advisory committee meets twice a year

- Board of education monthly meetings

- Leadership Academy for prospective principals (4-6 trainings per year)

- Leadership team meetings monthly

- All school sites produce a monthly newsletter

- Allows for engagement with both internal and external stakeholders

As detailed above, the applicant has put in to place many strategies for communication and engagement with all stakeholders. This strategic plan for communication will allow the district to continuously improve on the original design proposal with great transparency.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	**5**	**5**

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- applicant has a effectiveness monitoring plan outlined

- The evaluation tool or measure is listed

- For each proposed measure the applicant included a rational

- will provide feedback both in writing and orally

- Applicant has a plan of review and revision for professional development, teachers, school leadership, staff, technology, and modifications

As outlined above, this applicant has detailed a set of attainable performance measures that include a rationale and annual targets. In addition, an overall list and a subgroup list of measures are provided. This proposal has outlined a plan for review, feedback and revision over time that will be offered both orally and in writing to all stakeholders.

	Available	Score
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CCSD has a plan in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTTD funded activities as listed below:

- evidence will be based on increased productivity in usage of time, money, etc

- Use of technology

- increased community partner involvement

- compensation reform

- modification of school schedules and structures

While CCSD has a basic plan in place as detailed above, there is not much specific information in the narrative so therefore a high-medium score is evidenced.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant:

- provided an excellent description and rationale for the use of RTTD funds

- The amounts delineated appear to be sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal

- applicant noted sustainability beyond the grant that will be maintained by the district infrastructure and through initiatives such as GearUp, LEAPS, and Safe Schools

- additional sustainability partners listed - faith based organizations, community clubs, businesses and individuals

CCSD has clearly delineated the funds needed to support their proposal. The budget appears to be reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of this proposal. In addition, other sources of funding to carry this plan beyond the life of the grant were included in the narrative.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- applicant specifies that sustainability will occur with partnerships made during the grant period

- there was no mention of support from state and local government leaders and financial support

- additionally there was no mention of budget assumptions, potential sources or uses of funds for three years after the grant

While the applicant included a plan for sustainability through partnerships made during the grant period, the inclusion of long term budget assumptions and future uses of funds would have provided depth to this section.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**8**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The Campbell County School District has put together a holistic plan of action for the use of the RTTD grant monies. Below you will find bullet points of the proposals highlights. Throughout the proposal CCSD has outlined partnerships with local and state businesses, local colleges and tech schools, with medical facilities including mental health practioners.

-partnerships with local business

-partnerships with local colleges and tech schools

- plans for a quality after-school/tutoring program

- plans for a parent resource room at each site where parents can receive training and also materials for check out - computers, internet cards, etc

-the plan will provide extended day transportation so students can take advantage of activities and programs available

- the plan provides for a school health program including education, screenings and in some cases treatment

- the plan provides for a robust professional development program designed to instruct teachers in disaggregating data and putting it to effective use

-the Individualized Learning Plans provide for continuous evaluation of student acheivement through a variety of methods

-technology will be made available to each student (IPad)

-CCSD has a plan to engage parents and other caregivers in the development of their student

-has a developed a grant oversight committee made up of a variety of stakeholders that are charged with budget and expense updates, planned activities updates, status of each program or initiative, review of problems and successes

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Campbell County School District met the Absolute Priority 1 by providing a blueprint of how it will build on core assurance areas to create a learning environment that is designed to significantly improve learning and teaching strategies by:

- providing professional development for teachers to ensure all are able to analyze data effectively and translate it into applicable learning opportunities on an individualized level for each student.

- provided a plan of progression for improved student scores

- provided a clear and concise plan for technology integration

- provided a plan for partnerships and collaborations with various groups including post secondary institutions

- provided a plan for after school program/tutoring to further meet the academic needs of each student

-provides for curricular alignment to the common core standards, provides professional development to ensure success and provides a plan to inform and empower parents and students with specific data

Again, CCSD has created a holistic proposal for all students and families within their district. This plan is designed to meet the needs of students, families and communities. CCSD recognizes that importance of meeting students where they are and filling the immediate need (for example: health care and transportation) so that student achievement can be the focus. The integration of the personalized learning plan will effectively accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student, this in turn will decrease achievement gaps across student groups and increase the amount of graduates and elevate their readiness for college and careers.

Total	210	158

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0249TN-3 for Campbell County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Campbell County School System (CCSS) uses the state mandated TCAP exams as well as the Explore-Plan-and ACT to track student data. It is the school system's goal to monitor this data to identify and bridge gaps in student achievement. The primary achievement gap identified exists between the economically disadvantaged and the non-economically disadvantaged students. PARCC online assessments will be added in two years. A data system is already in place that provides additional data and tracking of TCAP, TVASS, and NAEP data. The PLAN exam is used as a college-readiness predictor and the ACT is used to track college readiness. Students, teachers, and parents will be provided access to the data to help students "chart their own path forward."

While providing data for students is helpful to them as individuals, a means of individualizing tasks based on student academic interests is not indicated. However, this approach may help accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and aid in increasing support and equity.

Graduation rates and college enrollment rates are included in the data, but the numbers included in the data charts are identical for graduation and college enrollment rates for each year reported. The data as presented would indicate that all CCSS graduates pursue post-secondary training, which does not seem realistic. TCAP and TVASS, while apparently state data sources, were not explained or described, leaving an unclear explanation of the sort of data provided for identifying needs and gaps.

While all expected elements are present, some details should have been further developed and acronyms lacked definition, reducing the clarity of aspects of the vision and proposal as a whole. The matched data for graduation rates and college enrollment should be explained. This section is therefore rated in the middle range of scores.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS plans to involve all of its schools and all grade levels due to high numbers of economically disadvantaged students system wide in what it has named the EPICC (Educational Performance In Campbell County) Program. 40,716 students in 12 schools will participate. All schools in the system meet eligibility criteria, have significant numbers of economically disadvantaged students, and need additional support to continue recent test score improvement. The process involved in ensuring eligibility included reviewing school demographic data, reviewing and validating performance data, and ensuring the support and interest of the supervision and staff of each school. Educator stakeholders further supported involvement through defining causes of performance gaps and identifying measures to close the existing gaps.

Percentages of households receiving food stamps and state insurance as well as poverty rates are listed. Literacy rates and other compelling data paint a picture of the need, emphasizing the disadvantaged state of the region. The breakdown of students by both number and percentage for low-income and high-need is provided, as well as the number of educators involved per school. The data clearly shows the high needs nature of all 12 of the CCSS schools.

The data provided supports the system-wide support called for in this application. Participation is clearly established across all 12 schools, all grade bands, and in all subject areas.   A lack of specificity regarding the process involved in obtaining support from the staff and supervision at each school placed the ranking at the lower end of the high range.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS plans to train teachers, students, and parents in data analysis throughout the school system. Focused programming will result in support for teacher training in Common Core Standards adoption, technology implementation, and working with parents. The plan is to improve student performance with plans to gain 1- 2% per year in summative assessments in math, language arts/reading, and science at each grade level. Similarly, plans exist to narrow the achievement gap for economically disadvantaged students by approximately 0.5-2% per year at each school in the system. Plans for improving graduation rates show an approximate 2% per year plan for growth. Data indicates a recent significant graduation rate decrease, with a graduation rate of only 35% at Jellico High School for 2011-2012. A graduation rate of 50% is predicted for the 2012-2013 year, followed by 2% growth per year for the next 3 years.

While the goals seem realistic and attainable overall, the plan does not provide a detailed description of a high quality plan for improvement. While use of data is an important aspect of the plan, a process is not delineated for training teachers, students, and parents in data analysis. While intent exists to keep the community engaged in innovations and informed of progress, no details are provided for how this will be achieved. Given the lack of specificity in its approach to meeting these goals, this section ranks in the middle range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Including professional development beyond state mandates in support of Common Core Standards adoption, use of technology, and assisting stakeholders in understanding and using data has potential to support the change needed to promote student growth and help CCSS meet established goals.

Current data demonstrates levels of proficiency that are very low, with only 3rd grade science proficiency exceeding 50%. Three elementary schools had "insufficient student population to qualify the data" listed in the Decreasing the Achievement Gap Goals section for Math grades 3-8. Two of these schools also did not have data listed for Language Arts 3-8. One high school similarly had "insufficient student population" indicated for English II. It is surprising that a system the size of CCSS does not have such data available.

The goals established seem realistic and attainable for improved summative assessment performance, decreasing the achievement gap, improving graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment rates system wide. Increases in proficiencies, gap narrowing, graduation and college enrollment rate improvements in the 1-2% range are attainable with improved practices and reasonable effort. Due to the absence of some achievement gap related data, paired with the lack of specificity in the actions planned to narrow the achievement gap, the application ranks in the upper middle range.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**9**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A clear record of success at the district level in the past four years is called for in this section. Data for only the past three years is provided. The data source(s) for tables in this section are unclear. In regard to writing for grades 5, 8, and 11, growth from B to A scoring for grades 5 and 11 is shared only for the 2010-2011 school year. An explanation of the A/B rating was not provided, resulting in a lack of meaning associated with these results. Mathematics performance for grades 4 through 8 has demonstrated growth overall, with some evident decline in grade 5. Reading Language Arts performance on the other hand has been experiencing an overall decline for the past 3 years. Achievement gaps have actually broadened slightly in three of the four indicated areas. The limitations experienced by CCSS might be attributed to the fact that the per pupil expenditure for the state of Tennessee has increased by about 8.9% while Campbell County School System's per student expenditure has only increased by about 3.8% since the 2007-2008 school year. Per pupil expenditure by CCSS was about 17.3% below the state average for 2010-2011. Six years ago, 10 of the 12 system schools were in good standing, with the two high schools of the system meeting school improvement. While this indicates some growth, explanation is missing regarding the specific causes for the two high schools to have not been in good standing. A High School Redesign grant was written for two high schools to improve student proficiency, use data to make informed decisions, and sustain improvements. It is unclear, but it seems that the changed status of the two high schools may have been the result of grant reforms.

The district uses a variety of means to make data available to students, including public Title I meetings to share data with stakeholders. School data is shared on the state website in the school report card. Students and educators receive student score information for all state tests. The district also uses MyGradePortal to communicate information regarding student achievement with parents.

It is evident that CCSS has developed a system for continuous feedback and improvement through informed decision making. According to the data provided, while CCSS has shown some limited improvements in the past few years, the challenges faced by the district make what might be interpreted as marginal gains seem much more substantial. Data sources were not clearly identified, which reduced the credibility of the data provided. Evidence of increased equity in education that might have the effect of narrowing the achievement gaps, improving graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment was not apparent. As a result, this section scores in the middle range.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	**5**	**5**

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

To promote transparency, CCSS makes a budget book available upon request that meets the established requirements for this section. CCSS also engages in a variety of additional actions that promote transparency. Open houses are held at each school to make LEA processes and practices public. The system's website also makes school board policies and practices available to the public. Meetings including those of the PTO, Title I, Open House, and school level meetings are well publicized through fliers and local media. Instructional staff salaries are disclosed at yearly Title I meetings. The CCSS budget is published in two newspapers. School Board meetings are held monthly and financial reports are discussed and distributed to community stakeholders at these meetings.

It is evident that CCSS operates with a high level of transparency. As a result, this section scores in the upper high range.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Through the state's Race To the Top initiatives, CCSS has many data tools for driving change. CCSS intends to use Individualized Learning Paths developed through testing and data analysis to appeal to student learning styles and needs, resulting in improved student performance and narrowed achievement gaps. Given that Tennessee awards student credits based on Carnegie Units, or seat time, potential challenges exist to creating individualized learning environments.

Race To the Top, Common Core State Standards adoption , and Carnegie Units are the only State legal, statutory, or regulatory requirements addressed in the proposal. Related changes support development of personalized learning environments as well as college and career readiness. While evidence reflecting the ability to create the personalized learning environments is clear, further details reflecting the state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements are lacking. For example, inclusion of state policies regarding online learning and alternative scheduling options may be useful in providing evidence of sufficient autonomy on the part of CCSS to create personalized learning environments. As a result, this section scores in the middle range.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Evidence exists in this section for a high degree of stakeholder engagement and support. Letters of support for the CCSS application include letters from the following stakeholders:

- Stemspark Director
- Beta Club Member
- National Junior Beta Club Sponsors (3)
- PTO Liaison
- PTO President, Caryville Elementary School
- Vice President Student Council, Jellico High School
- Jellico High School Faculty Member, Campbell County Federation of Teachers President, Tennessee Federation of Teachers President
- Assistant/Parent, Caryville Elementary
- Sponsor, CCHS Beta Club
- PTO Representative, LaFollette Elementary
- PTO President, White Oak Elementary
- Parent & Former Student, Jackboro Elementary
- Volunteer, Valley View Elementary
- Parent/unclear stakeholder role, Valley View Elementary
- Parent, Jacksboro Elementary
- Student Council Sponsor, Campbell County High School
- Student Council President, LaFollette Middle School
- Chairperson, Campbell County, TN Anti-Drug Coalition
- Family Resource Center Director, White Oak Elementary
- Pre-K Director/Consultant, Campbell County Schools
- CEO Community Health of East Tennessee
- State Certified Family Support Provider
- Assistant Director Tennessee Technology Center at Jacksboro
- Site Director, Campbell County Center, Roane State Community College
- Criminal Court Judge, State of Tennessee, Eighth Judicial District
- General Sessions/Juvenile Court Judge, Campbell County General Sessions Court
- General Manager, LaFollette Utilities
- President/CEO UBank
- Chairman, Campbell County School Board

Early involvement in generating ideas regarding the proposal included principals. Groups of stakeholders brainstormed county needs. Administration and LEA representatives then initiated a proposal process. Families, teachers, students,

and principals were surveyed with involvement of 75.5% of the teachers from all participating schools. The Title I school-wide committee, which includes teachers, parents, principals, supervisors, a parent involvement coordinator, and Title I Director was provided the opportunity to voice opinions regarding needs. Recommendations regarding school needs were taken from both meetings and survey data and adjusted accordingly. The resulting proposal includes recommendations that did not stem solely from proposals of the original planning group, but were developed through stakeholder input resulting from surveys and meetings.

Collective bargaining is no longer in existence at CCSS As a result, the AFT President submitted a letter of support and did not sign the application.

Given the extensive community support as evidenced by the numerous letters from a variety of individuals and organizational representatives, paired with a high degree of stakeholder involvement in the proposal development process, this section rates high in stakeholder engagement and support.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS analyzed needs and gaps with some limitations. Gap closures for economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities are indicated in the plan, but data supporting the gap for students with disabilities was not provided. This section was left blank in the gap analysis table.   The source(s) of the data in the Analysis of Needs and Gaps table is unclear. The acronym AMO is used and not defined.

Absence of personalized learning environments and the need for a pedagogical shift is clearly indicated. A clear, shared vision involving all stakeholders paired with a strategic plan to support and guide the change process is evident.

The plan for improvement focuses heavily on professional development, technology, and performance evaluation. The timeline provided prioritizes aspects of the plan, establishing personnel, professional development planning, parent center creation, and transportation needs as year one goals.   Year two focuses on technology purchases and installation, continued professional development, enhancement of parent centers with classes, and personnel evaluation and metrics. Year three continues with technology installation, added personnel evaluation and metrics, and adjustments to the program based upon gathered data. The fourth year of the program will involve continued evaluation of data and related adjustments.

A clear plan for evaluation of the current status was not clearly presented. However, statements indicating the current situation, required shifts, and goals were clearly presented. Data was missing for achievement gaps for students with disabilities, and acronyms used were not defined, making some data sources unclear. Therefore, the CCSS analysis of needs and gaps ranks in the lower middle range.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Building support within the school community through having seniors show upcoming freshmen around the school and establishing a mentor program involving juniors to support the incoming freshmen may be helpful in building community. Further establishing mentoring programs with college students, recent college graduates, and community leaders is a great way to provide role models to students that might encourage more students to complete high school and pursue post-secondary training. The orientation opportunities indicated will help students and parents understand what is needed to be successful in school.

Benchmark testing, end of course data, and TCAP results are all used to identify strengths and needs in core subject areas. Personalized learning paths will be created beginning in grade 3. Students will create personal profiles and portfolios reflecting academic and career interests. Students will create accounts with teacher help in kindergarten at

www.collegefortn.org, which will allow students to explore jobs in an interactive career game. The same site will allow students to apply to colleges directly from the website once they reach high school.

CCSS plans to make online tutoring available to students from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. daily. Students will each have an iPad and will be taught basic computer skills at the elementary level. Support is provided to college bound students and their parents through College Application Week, where support is provided for the college application process.   Given that 50% of parents do not have the ability to complete online forms, providing needed assistance through a graduation coach during this week is a great benefit to families.

Project based learning, including STEM classes, will be taught every   six weeks. Subgroups will also meet before and after school to pursue Odyssey of the Mind, Science Bowl, and Scholars Bowl. Student-led service models will be pursued to identify community needs and carry out plans to help out the community. Opportunities for dual enrollment are available to help students pursue goals for both college and careers.

Cultural visits will be planned, providing student opportunities to visit museums, plays, concerts, community events, and university events. Students will have the opportunity to visit colleges and universities for 3 or 4 days to better understand college life. Cultural trips will be sought out within the region and an additional foreign language teacher will be hired, possibly allowing for an additional language to be taught in the schools.

Six year planning involving students, parents, and counselors a minimum of two times per year provides great opportunities to establish and evaluate student goals based on needs and interest. Several services will be provided, including counselors or social workers, nurse practitioners, nutrition personnel, and a "clothes closet" to meet the needs of students in health, nutrition, safety, housing, planning for college and careers, and dealing with problems at home. The goal of these programs is to support students and provide assistance that will help students believe that postsecondary education is within their reach.

The plan for having teachers serve as coaches covering classes for other classroom teachers, at times enabling the other teachers to attend meetings, and at others providing in-classroom training may be an effective model. The indicated 60 day contracts for these peer coaches are very short however, and may result in inconsistencies that could limit the effectiveness of this plan.

The website, www.collegefortn.org, provides some interesting content, but the use of iPads and a computer skills course to boost technology skills should be further defined. The process involved with STEM classes being available to students every 6 weeks is also vague and requires further explanation.

While CCSS clearly has developed a learning approach that engages and empowers all students in an age-appropriate manner, further development should be included regarding the use of iPads and computer skills courses and implementation of STEM classes. The peer coaching approach may have limited effectiveness in its application due to the short contracts. Effective coaching relationships take time to establish for maximum effectiveness. The proposal lacks detail in its explanation of goals and implementation strategies that would be indicative of a high-quality plan. As a result, this section scores in the middle range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Improving teaching and learning is to be accomplished through a variety of measures. Adoption of Common Core Learning Standards will promote college and career readiness. Cross-curriculum lessons will help students make content connections between courses. Personalized learning plans paired with regular, systemic evaluation practices and early intervention practices supporting attainment of end of course assessment goals are helpful in guiding individualized instructional needs. These practices, maintained over time, support rigorous academic study, improved graduation rates, and college and career readiness. Plans to hire additional data and curriculum specialists will increase support to students. Project based learning, service learning, and the expansion of extra-curricular clubs and organizations are supportive of individualized learning opportunities that promote student interest in learning.

Principals and teachers regularly meet with their evaluators, reflecting upon practices. CCSS would like to provide educators opportunities to visit high-performing area schools to bring back practices of benefit to CCSS schools. A partnership with the University of Tennessee at Knoxville provides the opportunity for future math instructors in training to

serve CCSS classrooms during their senior year. This is a great way for teachers to learn new techniques and planning ideas from college students.

While regular assessment practices are apparently well-established, only a limited number of staff currently access student data to inform instructional practices. At the high school level, the Data and Curriculum Coordinator meets with teachers to discuss student data, but this practice should be extended to other grade levels. CCSS plans to make this happen. Extending the practice of data analysis to all grade levels will ensure that data is being used to inform decision making system-wide. This is an important step in system-wide continuous improvement.

For students in need of remedial coursework or alternative placement resulting from behavioral issues, the district provides an Alternative Learning Center. This center has lower student-teacher ratios and focuses on helping students meet graduation requirements, preparing these students for college and careers.

While CCSS seems to have a well-established system of gathering student data from a variety of sources, paired with limited evidence of the use data to inform instruction, a plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals is lacking. The concept of using teacher and principal evaluation data to improve educator effectiveness should also be developed. While CCSS intends to put much effort into personalizing learning and using student data to inform instruction, the missing aspects relating to teacher and principal evaluation and effectiveness limits the quality of the teaching and leading aspects of the plan, resulting in a score in the high middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**13**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district level LEA organizing or governance structure for CCSS has been clearly developed. The concept of leadership teams in schools with flexibility and autonomy over schedules, calendars, personnel decisions, staffing, and other issues on the other hand has not been established.

In regard to student progress based on mastery, CCSS is limited by state policy in that graduation requirements at the state level are based on Carnegie units and seat time. While evaluation of this policy is apparently underway, CCSS is unable to change the existing system.

Beginning in grade 3, benchmark testing is done four times per year. End of year course exams are given and specific subject area tests are given at the high school level annually. Several other testing sources, including state exams, are used to provide information that points out student needs, interests, and informs instructional practices. Courses also include a variety of other means of evaluating students based on classwork and assignments. Learning resources and instructional practices for all learners have some limitations. A significant part of the planning process for students involves meetings with parents and students to develop 6 year educational plans. A challenge to this process is that only 26% of CCSS students reside with both parents, making planning involving parents a challenge.

A previous section of the grant proposal referred to providing internet broadband cards to students lacking internet services in their homes so that they can receive online homework assistance. This is a great way to narrow the technology gap, or digital divide, making internet-based technologies available to all students in their homes as a learning resource. The provision to loan out iPads and laptops also supports proposal implementation and ensures that all students have access to needed resources.

While the governance structure has been well developed for the oversight of the entire system, the structure needs further development at the individual building level. Evidence is not present to suggest that school leadership teams have sufficient flexibility and autonomy to incorporate the required changes. Therefore, this portion of the application scores at the lower end of the high range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS has developed plans to support project implementation. Existing data systems provide data to the public regarding personnel, budgets, and instructional improvements. The system has clearly made an effort to reach out to all students and their families to provide resources and support, encouraging learning and future success in spite of significant socioeconomic challenges. The system plans to bring access to technology to all students in their homes through check out systems for devices such as laptops and iPads. CCSS will provide internet broadband cards, allowing home internet access to students lacking such access in their homes. A variety of additional support structures are to be provided to meet the needs of students in a variety of areas, including peer support through a mentoring program, local support from within the community, and special supports to meet student needs in a variety of areas, including student health and safety. Parents and students also have access to student data that is useful in progress monitoring and informed decision making.

The plans for technology use including check out systems and broadband cards, parent access to student grades, assignments and standards, as well as online homework support to students are commendable actions on the part of CCSS that will help ensure access and support to all students and their families. The provisions for support and resource availability aligned with policies and infrastructure result in a high rating for LEA and school infrastructure.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**11**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS has established a goal of continuously tracking and monitoring activities to develop a proactive, supportive organizational system focused on continuous learning. To implement a continuous improvement strategic process, a strategic plan will be developed by a team that will address each area in need of improvement, define weaknesses, understand school needs, and identify means of providing regular, timely feedback. The strategic plan is to be a working document, using real time information to review and revise implementation strategies.

Specific mention was not made of the period following the grant, leaving the plan for continuous improvement beyond the grant period unclear. The sort of change being implemented might be assumed to have lasting effects that are not explicitly stated. The change is highly focused on using data to drive instructional practice and personalize instruction. CCSS has a variety of tools or measures established to evaluate all activities and investments related to this grant.

The focus on creating a shared vision and continuous improvement with the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders is commendable, but the absence of an explanation of how the improvement will be sustained into the post-grant period results in a high middle range score for the continuous improvement process.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**5**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCSS shares a commitment to making performance results for its programs readily available and open to review by the public. The district holds regular public meetings that and a variety of internal meetings to communicate and evaluate practices. Each school produces a newsletter to provide current information to students and their families. A variety of events are held to promote and reward involvement in the school community. Plans are also in place for continuous gathering of data and evaluation of progress toward established goals. Teams will be formed to address areas in need of improvement. Real time information will be applied and reviewed to revise strategies. Specific assignments for monitoring a variety of aspects of the strategic plan are provided.   Responsibilities delineated include establishing decision making teams, collecting data, reviewing growth and effectiveness, and providing feedback.

Given the planned actions on the part of CCSS to engage the community, gather feedback from stakeholders, and apply informed decision making to continuous improvement efforts, this proposal scores high in ongoing communication and engagement.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

While evaluation tools or measures are provided for a variety of activities, the rationale behind selecting each of the listed items is not provided. Generalizations about the need for performance results to be available to the public and the value of oral and written feedback are addressed, but other aspects of the measures indicated should have a rationale provided. Strategies for the review and improvement of measures over time, if deemed insufficient to gauge implementation progress, is not addressed. For this reason, the proposal scored at the lower middle range for performance measures.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the funded activities lack development in this section. A plan for evaluating the effectiveness of investments is not present. This section reflects on productive use of time and resources to improve results and the use of technology, community partnerships, compensation reform, and school schedules and structures, including leadership teams, to support implementation and improve results.

Earlier sections reflect on continuous feedback and evaluation for improvement. Evaluation measures, including surveys, oral/written feedback, assessment data, and teacher evaluation data are listed as evaluation tools. The intent of these measures is to provide feedback to improve performance and a basis for decision making. An independent evaluator from the University of Tennessee, though not required, will be hired to evaluate the overall effectiveness of all resources and funded activities for the four year grant period.

Due to the limited explanation of plans provided for evaluating effectiveness of investments, scoring for evaluating the effectiveness of investments is at the low end of the middle range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The project budget highlights four Initiatives, identified as personnel, technology, transportation, and professional development. The LEA will sustain funds for the positions involved in oversight and implementation of the grant past the grant term. For technology, the existing department can maintain the systems established during the grant once they are in place. The grant calls for four technology positions for installation and setup of new equipment. A utility vehicle will also be used to move equipment. Additional smaller grants listed will help to provide sustainability over time. For the transportation initiative, partnerships with the community and its organizations will be called upon to help sustain support, keeping students in remote areas involved in extended day programming. The train the trainer model and professional learning communities will be used to ensure sustainability of professional development over time through the development of a collaborative atmosphere.

Budget tables are included in the proposal to communicate anticipated categorical budget expenditures. The four initiatives provide a basis upon which the grant budget as a whole was developed. Rationale for expenditures are provided. According to the budget information provided, the budget seems reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the CCSS proposal.

This section would have benefited from further development to clarify the sources of funding and to clearly identify the long term, versus single expenditure items. While ideas for sustainability are presented for each of the four priorities, the ability to realistically sustain some of these areas is questionable. After the grant period, the transportation costs, for example, will likely be very difficult to sustain with the community based sources indicated. The budget for the project therefore ranks in the upper-middle range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Sustainability of most of the project's goals seem reasonable. A 4 year budget as expected with the application is included, but no budget extending beyond the grant period is shared. While sources of funding expected to support sustainability are provided, no specifics are included. The nature of the change in the educational environment that will likely result from the proposal implementation will likely produce some sustainable, lasting change. Through the approaches involving leadership and professional development within the school, and changes in school climate and culture, a degree of sustainability might be anticipated. Sustainability of the more costly aspects, including maintaining key staffing positions and transportation for extended school day activities is questionable.

Support in the form of letters from Kevin Huffman, Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Education, and the Mayor of Campbell County Tennessee are included with the application.

Due to the limitations in evidence supporting project sustainability from a financial perspective, the budget and sustainability component of the proposal scores in the middle range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**8**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Public and private partnerships have clearly been established to support the proposal. Examples of sustainability successes include smaller grant funding sources, such as GEAR UP TN, LEAPS, and SAFE SCHOOLS. A listing of 29 individuals from a variety of community-based organizations will partner with CCSS in support of grant goals This listing includes partnerships with local post-secondary institutions that support sustainability of project goals.

Ten goals were identified that are in alignment with and provide support to the broader CCSS proposal. Each goal is paired with measurable results to identify success in meeting each goal. Data analysis will be applied to target resources and to provide support where it is most needed. Additional intensive instruction will be supported through a variety of techniques and resources. Two new staffing positions will be implemented to maintain the highest possible functioning level of the grant, in support of meeting these goals.

All students in the system are included in the proposed plan, so scaling the model beyond the participating students is not indicated here. Plans exist however, for having highly effective teachers serve as coaches, resulting in improved instructional practices system wide. Through collaboration, the resulting professional development will promote scaling of successes within the grant from single classrooms to many classrooms. Increased student performance is expected from this grant and knowledge gained by teachers is expected to improve as they will gain skills that enable them to teach effectively in a differentiated world.

CCSS has safe school plans on each campus. Both students and teachers have available mentors. Students receive training in bullying, safety, fitness, conflict resolution, tobacco prevention, child abuse, feelings, divorce, drug prevention, and culture. Partnerships have been created and professional development has supported school preparation for crisis situations.

CCSS will use instant messaging, and publicized meetings to encourage parents to attend informative and decision making meetings. The school will survey stakeholders twice annually to identify needs and assets. Grant administration will be adjusted based on needs reflected in the surveys. Surveys will be used to assess needs and assets of the school community. The decision making process outlined in the proposal is cyclical in nature, reflecting a constant need to re-evaluate data. Data teams and classroom teachers will use data to inform decision making relating to student progress toward goals, helping them to provide appropriate, timely interventions.

Some of the performance measures across the various population groups do not seem realistic. Closing all achievement gaps indicated does not seem likely within the scope of the grant. Specific data relating to the gaps involving students with

disabilities was not provided, making the disability gap closure reasonableness particularly difficult to evaluate. While the goal of closing gaps it admirable, it seems unlikely that the high achievement gaps indicated on in the grant application might be closed in four years. Increasing proficiencies of subject areas by 2% - 4% does seem reasonable and attainable with application of the continuous improvement process described in earlier sections. As a result, this proposal ranks at the low end of the high range for the Competitive Preference Priority.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

CCSS has coherently and comprehensively addressed plans to implement Common Core Learning Standards, promote college- and career- readiness, extend use of existing data systems to inform instructional practices, recruit and develop effective educators, and turn around its schools through improved student performance. As a result of the proposed project, the learning environment will be highly personalized, providing for accelerated student achievement and deepened student learning. As a result, achievement gaps can be expected to decrease across student groups, proficiency levels on assessments can be expected to rise, and the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers will increase. CCSS has clearly prioritized personalizing the learning environment to meet student needs, providing students a variety of supports to promote success. These supports include access to data and technology, peer mentoring, partnerships with local post-secondary institutions, and provisions for the health, safety, and welfare of students.

Total	210	146